

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of) **MAIL STOP AMENDMENT**
Vernon T. Brady et al.)
Application No.: 09/975,995) Group Art Unit: 2615
Filed: October 15, 2001) Examiner: Briney III, Walter F
For: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR) Confirmation No.: 9493
HIGH FREQUENCY WIRELESS)
COMMUNICATION)

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 11, 12, 19, 25, 26, 29, 36, 37, 40, 76-83, 86-94, and 97-102 remain pending, where claims 3-10, 13-18, 20-24, 17, 28, 30-35, 38, 39, 41-75, 84, 85, 95, 96, 103, and 104 were previously canceled.

In numbered paragraph 1 on page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 11, 12, 19, 25, 26, 29, 36, 37, 40, 76-83, 86-94, and 97-102 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first and second paragraphs, for allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement and for alleged indefiniteness. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner argues that Applicants' disclosed invention and Applicants' claims contradict. However, upon a careful reading of Applicants' disclosure one of ordinary skill would understand that the same two transceivers communicate over the communication link. The following